REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant has received the Office Action dated May 18, 2010 (hereinafter "Current Office Action"), in which the Examiner: 1) rejected claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 10-12, 39, and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Bonn et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,738,908, hereinafter "*Bonn*"); 2) rejected claims 3, 7, 9, 13, 16, 17, 20-22, 24-31, and 33-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over *Bonn* and Rothermel et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,678,827, hereinafter "*Rothermel*"); and 3) rejected claims 37, 38, 40, and 42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over *Bonn*, *Rothermel*, and Teng et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,380,008, hereinafter "*Teng*").

With this Response, Applicant has amended claims 8, 22, and 31. In light of the amendments and remarks presented herein, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

I.   REJECTIONS UNDER § 102(e) OVER *BONN*

A.   Independent Claim 1

Independent claim 1 requires "expanding at least one template at a central location to create a document comprising expanded information; and sending from the central location the document comprising the expanded information to said plurality of computing devices." The Examiner cited *Bonn* col. 6, lines 30-53 as allegedly teaching "sending . . . the document . . . to said plurality of computing devices." However, the cited portion of *Bonn* teaches that that a network security policy is transmitted to the network security device for the current network." Thus, *Bonn* fails to teach "sending . . . the document . . . to said plurality of devices," but rather, clearly teaches sending a policy to a single security device. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 1, 2, 4-6, and 39.

B.   Claim 4-6

The Examiner rejected claims 4-6 as allegedly anticipated by *Bonn*. However, claims 4-6 depend from and incorporate all the limitations of claim 3. The Examiner admitted that *Bonn* fails to teach all the limitations of claim 3.

Current Office Action, p. 6.   Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 4-6 are allowable over *Bonn*.

C.   Independent Claim 8

Independent claim 8 requires "a database system which stores a plurality of templates which reflect said policies." The Examiner cited *Bonn* col. 6, lines 25 as allegedly teaching these limitations.   The cited portion of *Bonn* teaches a memory that contains policy templates.   However, no one skilled in the computer arts would equate a memory with a database system.   According to the Microsoft Computer Dictionary 5th Ed. (2002), a *database* is a file composed of records, each containing fields together with a set of operations for searching, sorting, recombining, and other functions." *Bonn* fails to teach any such structure, and fails to even mention a *database*.

Claim 8 has also been amended to require that "at least one of the templates are configured to selectably incorporate a policy defined only by a different template."   Support for this amendment can be found at least at p. 7, line 22 to page 8, line 6 of the specification.   *Bonn* teaches template creation and templates providing different security services, *Bonn* Figs. 15-16 and col. 8, lines 1-54, and teaches using a template to generate a policy, *Bonn*, col. 6, lines 30-52, but fails to teach that a template is configured to incorporate a policy defined exclusively by a different template.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 8, 10-12, and 41 are allowable over the cited art.

D.   Claim 10-12

The Examiner rejected claim 10-12 as allegedly anticipated by *Bonn*. However, claims 10-12 depend from and incorporate all the limitations of claim 9.   The Examiner admitted that *Bonn* fails to teach all the limitations of claim 9.   *Current Office Action*, p. 6.   Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 10-12 are allowable over *Bonn*.

II.   REJECTIONS UNDER § 103 OVER *BONN* AND *ROTHERMEL*

A.   Independent Claim 22

Independent claim 22 requires "creating a document at a central location comprising a listing of users identified in said template and users identified by any externally referenced information." The Examiner admitted that *Bonn* fails to teach these limitations, *Current Office Action*, p. 8, and cited *Rothermel*, col. 11, lines 18-30 as allegedly so teaching. The cited portion of *Rothermel* refers to *Rothermel* Fig. 3F, an example of a user interface for configuring a security policy template showing a "ping" service and a "Watchguard" service. The cited portion of *Rothermel* further teaches that configuring a network security device can include specifying customer contact information. However, *Rothermel* does not teach or suggest that the expanded template includes a "listing of users identified in said template." "Company name, contact person, customer ID, etc." is not a listing of users, but rather information usable to contact a purchaser of an NSD. Moreover, the cited portion of *Rothermel* fails to teach or suggest that customer contact information is included in the document created via template expansion.

Furthermore, the cited portion of *Rothermel* fails to teach or suggest that the document created via template expansion includes *users identified by externally referenced information*. The cited portion of *Rothermel* fails to even mention including externally referenced users lists in template expansion.

Claim 22 has also been amended to require "configuring at least one of the templates to selectably incorporate a policy defined only by a different template." Support for this amendment can be found at least at p. 7, line 22 to page 8, line 6 of the specification. *Bonn* teaches template creation and templates providing different security services, *Bonn* Figs. 15-16 and col. 8, lines 1-54, and teaches using a template to generate a policy, *Bonn*, col. 6, lines 30-52, but fails to teach that a template is configured to incorporate a policy defined exclusively by a different template. *Rothermel* fails to satisfy this deficiency of *Bonn*.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 22 and 24-30 are allowable over the cited art.

B.   Independent Claim 31

Independent claim 31 includes limitations similar to those of claim 22 explained above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 31 and 33-36 are allowable over the cited art for much the same reasons as are given above with regard to claim 22.

C.   Claims 3, 7, 20, and 21

Claims 3, 7, 20, and 21 depend from independent claim 1. *Rothermel* fails to satisfy the deficiency of *Bonn* explained above with regard to claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 3, 7, 20, and 21 are allowable over the cited art for much the same reason as is given above with regard to claim 1.

D.   Claims 9, 13, 16, and 17

Claims 9, 13, 16, and 17 depend from independent claim 8. *Rothermel* fails to satisfy the deficiency of *Bonn* explained above with regard to claim 8. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 9, 13, 16, and 17 are allowable over the cited art for much the same reason as is given above with regard to claim 8.

III.   REJECTIONS UNDER § 103 OVER *BONN, ROTHERMEL,* AND *TENG*

Claims 37, 38, 40, and 42 depend from claims 31, 22, 1, and 8 respectively. *Teng* fails to satisfy the deficiencies of *Bonn* and *Rothermel* explained above with regard to claims 31, 22, 1, and 8. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 37, 38, 40, and 42 are allowable over the cited art for much the same reasons as are given above with regard to the independent claims from which each respectively depends.

IV.   CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that for at least the reasons presented above, all claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is

believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

/David M. Wilson/

David M. Wilson
Reg. No. 56,790
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
Phone: (713) 238-8000
Fax: 238-8008
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
3404 E. Harmony Road
Fort Collins, CO 80528